



Agenda

RACIAL JUSTICE TASK FORCE

May 16, 2018
1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
651 Pine St Rm 101,
Martinez

Agenda Items:

1. **1:00-1:05 Introductions**
2. **1:05-1:10 Meeting Objectives**
3. **1:10-1:15 Approval of the Meeting Minutes (Action Item)**
4. **1:15-1:20 Public Comment on any item under the jurisdiction of the Task Force and not on this agenda.**
(Speakers may be limited to three minutes.)
5. **1:20-2:15 Community Feedback on Preliminary Recommendations (Presentation and Discussion)**
6. **2:15-2:45 Additions to or Revisions of Preliminary Recommendations (Presentation and Discussion)**
7. **2:45-3:25 Review of Voting Agreements (Action Item)**
8. **3:25-3:30 Next Steps**
9. **3:30 Adjourn**

☺ The Office of Reentry & Justice will provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities planning to attend Racial Justice Task Force meetings. Contact the person listed below at least 72 hours before the meeting.

📁 Any disclosable public records related to an item on a regular meeting agenda and distributed by the County to a majority of members of the Racial Justice Task Force less than 96 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at 651 Pine Street, 10th floor, during normal business hours.

✉ Public comment may be submitted via electronic mail on agenda items at least one full workday prior to the published meeting time.

For Additional Information Contact:

Lara DeLaney, Director of Office of
Reentry & Justice
Phone (925) 335-1097 Fax (925) 335-1098
Lara.DeLaney@cao.cccounty.us

Glossary of Acronyms, Abbreviations, and other Terms (in alphabetical order):

Contra Costa County has a policy of making limited use of acronyms, abbreviations, and industry-specific language in its Board of Supervisors meetings and written materials. Following is a list of commonly used language that may appear in oral presentations and written materials associated with Board meetings:

AB	Assembly Bill	HIPAA	Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments	HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Syndrome
ACA	Assembly Constitutional Amendment	HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990	HR	Human Resources
AFSCME	American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees	HUD	United States Department of Housing and Urban Development
AICP	American Institute of Certified Planners	Inc.	Incorporated
AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome	IOC	Internal Operations Committee
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commission	ISO	Industrial Safety Ordinance
AOD	Alcohol and Other Drugs	JPA	Joint (exercise of) Powers Authority or Agreement
ARRA	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	Lamorinda	Lafayette-Moraga-Orinda Area
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District	LAFCo	Local Agency Formation Commission
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit District	LLC	Limited Liability Company
BCDC	Bay Conservation & Development Commission	LLP	Limited Liability Partnership
BGO	Better Government Ordinance	Local 1	Public Employees Union Local 1
BOS	Board of Supervisors	LVN	Licensed Vocational Nurse
CALTRANS	California Department of Transportation	MAC	Municipal Advisory Council
CalWIN	California Works Information Network	MBE	Minority Business Enterprise
CalWORKS	California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids	M.D.	Medical Doctor
CAER	Community Awareness Emergency Response	M.F.T.	Marriage and Family Therapist
CAO	County Administrative Officer or Office	MIS	Management Information System
CCHP	Contra Costa Health Plan	MOE	Maintenance of Effort
CCTA	Contra Costa Transportation Authority	MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
CDBG	Community Development Block Grant	MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act	NACo	National Association of Counties
CIO	Chief Information Officer	OB-GYN	Obstetrics and Gynecology
COLA	Cost of living adjustment	O.D.	Doctor of Optometry
ConFire	Contra Costa Consolidated Fire District	OES-EOC	Office of Emergency Services-Emergency Operations Center
CPA	Certified Public Accountant	OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
CPI	Consumer Price Index	Psy.D.	Doctor of Psychology
CSA	County Service Area	RDA	Redevelopment Agency
CSAC	California State Association of Counties	RFI	Request For Information
CTC	California Transportation Commission	RFP	Request For Proposal
dba	doing business as	RFQ	Request For Qualifications
EBMUD	East Bay Municipal Utility District	RN	Registered Nurse
EIR	Environmental Impact Report	SB	Senate Bill
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	SBE	Small Business Enterprise
EMCC	Emergency Medical Care Committee	SWAT	Southwest Area Transportation Committee
EMS	Emergency Medical Services	TRANSPAC	Transportation Partnership & Cooperation (Central)
EPSDT	State Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and treatment Program (Mental Health)	TRANSPLAN	Transportation Planning Committee (East County)
et al.	et ali (and others)	TRE or TTE	Trustee
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration	TWIC	Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	UCC	Urban Counties Caucus
F&HS	Family and Human Services Committee	VA	Department of Veterans Affairs
First 5	First Five Children and Families Commission (Proposition 10)	vs.	versus (against)
FTE	Full Time Equivalent	WAN	Wide Area Network
FY	Fiscal Year	WBE	Women Business Enterprise
GHAD	Geologic Hazard Abatement District	WCCTAC	West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee
GIS	Geographic Information System		
HCD	(State Dept of) Housing & Community Development		
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services		

Schedule of Upcoming Meetings



Racial Justice Task Force Kickoff Meeting Minutes

Racial Justice Task Force Members

4.4.18

Member	In Attendance
1. Todd Billeci, Chief Probation Officer	Present
2. Debra Mason, Mount Diablo Unified School District (MDUSD)	Not present
3. Robin Lipetzky, Public Defender	Not present
4. Dennisha Marsh, First Five CCC, City of Pittsburg Community Advisory Council	Present
5. Venus Johnson, Assistant District Attorney	Present
6. Magda Lopez, Director of Court Programs and Services	Present
7. Harlan Grossman, Government Alliance of Race & Equity (GARE)	Present
8. John Lowden, Contra Costa County Sherriff's Office	Present
9. Dr. Christine Gerchow, Psychologist at Juvenile Hall Martinez	Present
10. Stephanie Medley, RYSE & AB109 CAB	Present
11. Marcus Walton, Director of Communications West Contra Costa Unified School District	Present
12. Bisa French, Assistant Chief at Richmond Police Department	Not present
13. Dr. Cardenas Shackelford, Coordinator Student Intervention and Support, Antioch Unified School District	Present
14. Tamisha Walker, Founder & Director Safe Return Project	Present
15. Pastor Donnell Jones, Richmond Ceasefire	Not present
16. Reverend Leslie Takahashi, Mt. Diablo Universalist Church	Present
17. Dr. William Walker, Health Services Director	Present

Resource Development Associates

- Mikaela Rabinowitz
- David Muhammad
- Lupe Garcia

Public Attendees

- Donte Blue
- Lara Delaney
- Jill Ray
- Judith Tannenbaum
- Doug Leich



Meeting Notes

- I. Introductions
- II. Meeting Objectives
 - RDA shared that today's objectives is to continue the discussion of set recommendations that the Racial Justice Task Force will put forth to the Board of Supervisors in June. Prior to this meeting, RDA took the array of recommendations developed through the meetings, looked for commonalities and synthesized the recommendations into a framework of processes. Today's focus will be about the recommended set of prioritized recommendations that will be taken to the community forums.
 - RDA reviewed the timeline of recommendations. Based on the feedback heard throughout the community forums, RJTF members will vote for the set of prioritized recommendations during the June meeting and think about the steps needed to move the recommendations forward and actualize them.
- III. Approval of Meeting Minutes
 - **March meeting minutes were approved.**
- IV. Public Comment (items not on the agenda)
 - A public attendee asked if this was the time to respond to the set of recommendations. RDA shared the public will have the opportunity to respond after members discuss.
 - No other public comments.
- V. Community Forums
 - Tamisha reported the locations of the community forums are confirmed: Walnut Creek, Antioch, and Richmond. Flyers are available in English and Spanish for each location. There are also Facebook events for each community forum. The next step is for RJTF to share and disseminate the information to increase community participation.
 - Lara shared she has invited Board of Supervisors whose locations will be hosting a community forum. She shared a press release has been approved.
 - RDA shared there needs to be a good representation of RJTF in the forums. It is a good space for Task Force members to talk to the community and hear directly from the public about their concerns. They shared it is very important the Task Force does outreach to ensure community attendance. RDA also shared the community forum workgroup will be working on a preliminary agenda that will be later shared to the larger group via email communication since the Task Force will not be meeting until after the community forums.
- VI. Prioritization Criteria
 - RDA presented the criteria the recommendations were framed with: cost, impact, and jurisdiction. RDA shared the criteria is not intended to be measureable but rather a way to start thinking about the recommendations.
 - i. Cost: High, medium, and low



Contra Costa County

Racial Justice Task Force—Meeting #13 Notes

- ii. Impact: Potential number effected and impact on disparities at the point
 - iii. Jurisdiction: City, County, State, Community
- RDA asked the group how they want to arrive to the number of recommendations delivered to the Board of Supervisors.
 - i. A Task Force member shared that the task force should review all the recommendations regardless of cost.
 - ii. A Task Force member responded that from a community standpoint, they should be looking at the impact on people lives and if they cost more, they can make a case for it.
 - iii. A Task Force member agreed and suggested looking at the population most hurt and disfranchised and start from there.
 - iv. Public attendee stated that one of the fundamental reasons the task force was funded was to focus on racial disparities. While costs needs to be considered and other impacts, the underlying inherited purpose for this task force is reducing racial disparities.
 - v. **Based on this conversation, the group agreed to not use cost as a criteria for prioritizing or removing recommendations. Impact on disparities is the key priority.**
- RDA explained how some recommendations could reduce the population impacted but not reduce disparities. They explained it is important to assess numeric versus rate.
 - i. A Task Force member shared this is what is happening at schools with suspension rates. While suspension rates have decreased, the number of non-white students who are suspended is still disproportionate and disparities persist.
 - ii. Another Task Force member raised the question of the absence of a recommendation that is specific to school districts and suspension practices.
 - iii. A Task Force member suggested leveraging the Task Force's influence to the Board of Supervisors and Office of Education to make impact at the local school level. She said it is important to address discipline practices in school districts especially since they were mentioned in the first round of community forums.
 - 1. **The recommendations were revised to more clearly articulate that the County should use its leverage via LCAP funding to push for certain school actions. In addition, the TF will include recommendations directly to school districts as a preliminary recommendation (still needs to be voted on for formal approval).**
- Several task force members stated that it is very important that all current preliminary recommendations plus those added today go to the community forums for additional input and go up for a vote.



- i. **Based on this conversation, the forums will include all current preliminary recommendations and allow community members to weigh in. Then all recommendations will come to the Task Force for a vote.**
 1. A public attendee suggested purposing a multi-year plan.
 2. A Task Force member stated the task force needs to consider how the recommendations will impact the entities responsible for implementing them.

VII. Review of recommendations

- Rec 1:
 - i. A Task Force member shared some community members have come across fraudulent community courts and fees therefore, the county should provide a legitimate list of diversion programs.
- Rec 5:
 - i. A Task Force member shared the county is entertaining the idea of diversion programs. The county has consulted with current programs and they were told that parents are more willing to enroll their youth and have increased buy-in if there is a fee. There is a perception of legitimacy with a fee. However, John shared that a fee should not be required as a condition to participate in the programs. Fee waivers are provided for those who cannot afford the fee.
- Rec 6:
 - i. A public attendee shared that the behavioral health department currently has a juvenile crisis team that they are expanding. They are also creating a mobile crisis team for adults and NET program.
- Rec 8:
 - i. A Task Force member shared the Probation Department is re-processing DRAI, and re-evaluating Post-Disposition Risk assessment. They also shared they are doing a graduated response grid for the AB 109 population.
- Rec 17:
 - i. Task Force members discussed the challenges of implementing Restorative Justice practices and maintaining fidelity to such best practices. Members suggested that this recommendation should include continuous training and evaluation.
 - ii. Task Force members discussed the issues of recommendations and practices that focus on youth discipline rather than on how adults react and interact with youth, specifically in school and with suspension practices. Such practices can exacerbate racial disparities.
 - iii. A public attendee suggested that the Behavioral Health department reach out to school districts and offer behavioral health assistance to youth who may be struggling with behaviors that lead to delinquency.



1. A Task Force member agreed it would be a great partnership as many youth receive services from health centers located in school sites.
- iv. **A Task Force member suggested adding a recommendation around Local Control Funding to support these recommendations and push schools to follow best practices.**
- Rec 19: Task force members discussed the idea of an independent body for oversight and monitoring and the challenges it may present regarding data sharing.
 - i. To limit the number of new committees, the Task Force agreed to the following change: **Assess current county commissions / committees that can effectively take on recommendations.**
- Rec 24: A Task Force member asked if the Task Force would be providing recommendations for the District Attorney aside from charges and sentencing. They expressed a concern regarding attaching the recommendation to Proposition 57 as it is currently being scrutinized.
 - i. **The recommendation will exclude the wording Prop 57. Instead the recommendation will describe Prop 57**
- Rec 25: A Task Force member suggested the recommendation should **include partnering with those that do the same assessments in order to reduce duplications.**
- Rec 29: A Task Force member shared that the idea of this recommendation is ensure detainees have their rights. This specific recommendation came out the community due to the current conditions of facilities and the disparity of treatment for individuals who are undocumented and Black.
- Rec 30: A Task Force member suggested defining “independent body” as an exclusion of employees that are involved.

VIII. Discussion of Final Set of Recommendations

- RDA asked the Task Force if seventeen recommendations was too high of a number and most members said yes.
- Task Force members discussed Recommendations 20 and 21. A Task Force member shared the 50% attached to the recommendation seems arbitrary and that currently 23% of current funds are going to community-based organizations for community programs and public agencies.
 - i. **Task Force members agreed to take this recommendation off the priority list however, the Task Force would like to investigate what information is needed to come to a feasible number that allows increased funding.**
- Task Force members discussed the lack of data to analyze to focus on specific disparities throughout the system. Specifically, Task Force members discussed Recommendation 2 and how it is not based on analyzed data due to unavailability. They discussed the importance of agencies collection and analyzing data in order to put forth the recommendations.



Contra Costa County

Racial Justice Task Force—Meeting #13 Notes

- A Task Force member shared change does not automatically happen without the participation and voice of the community. They shared by bringing these issues and recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, it can bring attention to certain agencies.
- A public attendee shared the **Task Force needs to look back at the input provided during the first round of community forums and integrate it when finalizing the priorities.**
- Two Task Force members shared they are not comfortable supporting Recommendations 29 and 30 because it they do not think they are aligned with the purpose of the Task Force.
 - i. Another Task Force member responded that this recommendation rose from the community and that is what happens when a space is open to the community. Community voice brings a perspective to the table that otherwise would be absent.
- A Task Force member agreed, stating that the issue with the Sherriff's Office and ICE has been a long-standing issue for the faith-based community.

IX. Next Steps

- The community forum workgroup will think about how the recommendations are presented to the community and ensure sufficient context is provided.
 - i. **RDA will send the materials to the full Task Force for review prior to the community forums.**



RACIAL JUSTICE TASK FORCE

Resource Development Associates



May 16, 2018

Introductions



Agenda

- Introductions
- Meeting Objectives
- Community Forums
- Review Recommendations
- Discuss Voting Process
- Next Steps



4

Meeting Minutes



5

Public Comment



Project Activities and Timeline

	2017												2018				
	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J		
Project Launch and Convening																	
Review System Process Flows and Data																	
Focus on Local Law Enforcement																	
Focus on County Juvenile Justice System																	
Focus on County Adult Justice System																	
Finalize Recommendations																	
Community Forums																	
Present Recommendations to Board																	

Monthly RJTF Project Meetings, Presentations to Key Stakeholders



Round #2: Community Forums

7

*Mt. Diablo Unitarian
Universalist Church,
Walnut Creek*

May 7, 2018

59 participants

TF Members: Todd, Leslie,
Harlan, Venus, John,
Debra

*Delta Bay Church of
Christ, Antioch*

May 8, 2018

24 participants

TF Members: Todd,
Debra, Dennisha, Harlan,
Tamisha, Cardenas

*Catholic Charities of
the East Bay,
Richmond*

May 9, 2018

38 participants

TF Members: Stephanie,
Leslie, Robin, Harlan,
Bisa, Marcus



Breakout Groups' Highest Priorities among Preliminary Recommendations

8

Expand diversion and
criteria

Establish sliding scale fee
and/or provide fee waiver
for pre-trial and diversion
programs

Develop data collection and
accountability measures

Establish oversight
committee for
implementation process that
includes community members
such as formerly justice
involved

Ensure recommendation
planning process includes
community input through
community forums



Breakout Groups' Key Concerns and Gaps In Preliminary Recommendations

9

Key Concerns

- Available funding and budget prioritization for recommendations
- Misuse of publically available data
- Assess use of language
 - Should vs. mandate
 - Use less jargon
- Buy-in from implementing partners such as education
- Language accessibility for programs/ services

Gaps

- Use of force policies and police engaged violence
- Public disclosure and monitoring of police misconduct
- Recruitment and retention of school staff that are reflective of communities they serve
- Community centered services that prevent any contact with the justice system
- Staffing and racial disparities in various policing agencies
- Body cameras for law enforcement



Top Supported Recommendations

10

1

- County justice partners and Police Chief's Association should establish criteria for informal & formal diversion, with focus on offenses with greatest racial disparity

1a

- Criteria for diversion should include non-violent felony level crimes such as burglary

1b

- Criteria for diversion include individuals with prior justice system involvement

2

- LEAs should establish formal partnerships with CBOs to provide diversion programs & services for youth and adults. Diversion programs should be free of charge

3

- Expand Crisis Intervention Teams, Mobile Crisis Teams, and System-Wide Mental Health Assessment Teams countywide

8

- Provide resources to ensure integration of de-escalation and mental health intervention trainings into LEA regional academy and/or department orientations



Top Recommendations Left Blank

11

6b

- Justice partners and local LEAs should improve capacity for data collection and analysis including expanding staff with data analysis capabilities

6c

- ORJ should support analysis of interventions implemented through RJTF to measure efficacy and assess impact on racial disparities

10a

- Establish partnership with school districts to provide behavioral health services for youth presenting signs of distress. Services should be co-located at school-based clinics and health centers.

11

- County should leverage LCAP funding to establish district-level programs that aim to reduce racial disparities within school discipline practices

16a

- Return to a regionalized felony trial court system

16b

- Return to a regionalized jury selection process

20

- Expand the current pre-release pilot to serve all individuals in custody

R D A

Top Revised Recommendations

12

2a

- County justice partners should establish formal partnerships with CBOs to provide diversion programs & services for youth and adults. All diversion programs should be offered free of charge.

6

- Justice partners and local LEAs should collect individual-level data on all individual encounters with criminal and juvenile justice systems and processes. They should consult best practices to balance data needs with confidentiality concerns.

7

- Create workgroup that includes reps from the BoS, Community Advisory Board, region-wide CBOs, reps from school districts, Probation, Judges, DA's office, and Public Defender's office to review data on quarterly basis to identify where disparities exist in county's system and identify mechanisms for reducing racial disparities.

11

- The County should leverage Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) funding to establish district-level programs that aim to reduce racial disparities within school discipline practices.

15

- The County and/or oversight body should collaborate with Probation to research how much realignment funding can be increased for community services.

R D A

13

Deep Dive into Individual Recommendations

- Use Recommendations Feedback Form



14

Any revisions or additions?



15

Voting Process



Voting Agreements and Proposed Changes

“No” vote by
four TF members
blocks
recommendation

Vote by straight up
and down majority

Designee can
participate in
meeting but
can't vote

Task Force Designee
can vote if task
force member can't
attend



Next Steps

- Voting at June TF Meeting

